why he should take objection today when other members ask for clarifications. Anyhow, I am of opinion that the members will bear with me when I point out that certain matters which have been established and taken for granted should not be questioned. I can only make an appeal in this respect. I cannot shut out members from raising points of orders. They have a right to raise points of order, but points of order on matters which have been long established or taken for granted, may not be raised again.

5 P. M.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA (Palaiyam).—My clarification is this, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—All clarifications may be replied.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—The Hon'ble Minister was pleased to say that Rule 118 has no application. I want to know whether the General Clauses Act does not say that singular includes plural and Minister includes Ministers ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಎಕ್. ಮೂಡಲಗಿರಿಗೌಡ.—ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ರಾಜಿನಾಮೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಗವರ್ನರ್ ಅವರಿಗಿಲ್ಲವೆ ? ಲೀಡರ್ ಅವರು ರಾಜೀನಾಮೆಯನ್ನು ಗವರ್ನರ್ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಅಂಗೀಕಾರ ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ನ್ಯಾಯವೇ ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅದು ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗದಲ್ಲೇ ಇದೆ.

(*Sri B. K. Puttaramiya rose.*)

Mr. SPEAKER.—I want to make a last appeal to you Sri. Puttaramiya, that you please bear with me.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIYA.—I am so sorry Mr. Speaker, I am obeying the Chair on all occasions and will continue to do so. In spite of that, I do not know why the Chair is always on me.

Mr. SPEAKER.—No, I am not always on you. You are on me.

ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ. ಎಕ್. ಮೂಡಲಗಿರಿಗೌಡ.—ರಾಜೀನಾಮೆಯನ್ನು ಅಂಗೀಕಾರಮಾಡಿ, ಬೇರೆಯವರನ್ನು ನೇಮಕ ಮಾಡಲು ಗವರ್ನರ್ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿಲ್ಲವೆ ? ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ 'ಕ್ಲಾರಿಫಿಕೇಷನ್' ಕೇಳುವ ಅಗತ್ಯ ವೇನಿದೆ ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಏನು ಮಾಡುವುದು ? ಕೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

Let us close this chapter. Has the Hon'ble the Chief Minister anything to say ?

Sri B. D. JATTI.—According to me Sir, no point was raised on which there was any necessity to give clarification. The point is very clear. I have made it very clear that there is no convention either in this country or elsewhere when a Ministry has made any statement. So, I think it does not require any clarification.

Sri B. K. PUTTARAMIYA.—I want to know how long we are going to sit.

Mr. SPEAKER.—We are sitting up to seven.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE.

(i) Ordinances.

Sri K. F. PATIL (Minister for Agriculture and Food).—I beg to lay on the table "the Madras Commercial Crops Markets (Mysore Amendment and Validation of Levy of Cess) Ordinance, 1958;

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA (Minister for Revenue).—I beg to lay on the Table (1) the Mysore Tenancy Laws (Amendment) Ordinance, 1958;

(2) the Madras Cultivating Tenants Protection (Mysore Amendment) Ordinance, 1958.

Sri MALI MARIAPPA (Minister for Co-operation).—I beg to lay on the Table the Hyderabad Co-operative Societies (Mysore Amendment) Ordinance, 1958.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA (Minister for Law, Labour and Local Self-Government).—I beg to lay on the Table the Madras Area Municipalities (Extension of Term of Councillors) Ordinance, 1958.

(ii) Notifications.

Sri B. D. JATTI (Chief Minister).—I beg to lay on the Table the following notifications :—

Notification No. HD. 168 MVT. 57, dated 1st May 1958;
Notification No. HD. 22 (a) MVT. 58, dated 2nd May 1958,
Notification No. HD. 38 TST. 57, dated 17th May 1957,
Notification No. HD. 5 MVT. 58, dated 2nd June 1958,
Notification No. HD. 45 MVT. 58, dated 31st May 1958,

(SRI B. D. JATTI)

Notification No. HD. 42 MVT. 58, dated 22nd May 1958,
Notification No. HD. 36 MVT. 58, dated 21st May 1958,
Notification No. HD. 22 MVT. 58, dated 2nd May 1958,
Notification No. HD. 47 MVT. 58, dated 11th July 1958.
Notification No. HD. 7 MVF. 58, dated 2nd July 1958,
Notification No. HD. 90 MVT. 58, dated 6th August 1958,
Notification No. HD. 142 MVT. 58, dated 31st July 1958,
Notification No. HD. 165 MVT. 57, dated 13th August 1958,
Notification No. HD. 88 MVT. 58, dated 21st August 1958,

issued under sub-section (1) of section 16 and section 22 of the Mysore Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1957.

Notification No. HD. 1 MVF. 58, dated 14th July 1958,
Notification No. HD. 66 MVF. 57, dated 17th May 1958,
Notification No. HD. 4 MVF. 58, 18th August 1958,

issued under section 68 of the Motor Vehicles Act, 1939 (Central Act IV of 1939).

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—I beg to lay on the Table the following notifications :—

Notification No. RD. 14 RGN. 58, dated 19th March 1958,
Notification No. RD. 1 SPS. 58-1, dated 25th March 1958,
Notification No. RD. 14 RGN., dated 1st April 1958,
Notification No. RD. 14 RGN., dated 1st April 1958,
Notification No. RD. 41, RGN. 57, dated 19th December 1957,
Notification No. RD. 1 SPS. 58, dated 21st January 1958,
Notification No. RD. 79 ERS. 57, dated 14th March 1958,
Notification No. RD. 6 SPS. 58, dated 19th March 1958,
Notification No. RD. 2 RGN. 58, dated 29th April 1958,

issued under Section 9 of the Mysore Stamp Act, 1900,

Notification No. RD 6 SPS. 58, dated 1st April 1958,
Notification No. RD. 6 (A) SPS. 58, dated 7th June 1958,
Notification No. RD. 24 SPS. 58, dated 23rd August 1958,

issued under Section 9 of the Mysore Stamp Act, 1957.

Notification No. RD. 19 HRC. 57, dated 28th April 1958,

issued under clause (*a*) of Section 31 of the Hyderabad Houses (Rent, Eviction and Lease) Control Act, 1954.

Notification No. RD. 19, HRC., dated 16th July 1958,

issued under Section 20 of the Mysore House Rent and Accommodation Control Act, 1951,

Notification No. RD. C2 TNC. 57, dated 17th July 1957,
Notification No. RD. C2 TNC. 57, dated 31st July 1957,
Notification No. RD. 26 TNY. 57/A, dated 16th December 1957,

issued under Section 17 of the Madras Cultivating Tenants (Payment of Fair Rent) Act, 1956.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA (Palaiyam).—On a point of order, Sir. These several notifications have been given to us now, Sir. I see that some of the notifications are dated prior to 1st November 1956 presumably issued in the old Mysore State, with which we are not concerned. Even if it is argued that it is a continuity of administration and continuity of action, or whatever the intention of the Government is in placing these notifications before this House at any time they please, Sir, it is not the way to treat the Assembly. I would say that it is scant courtesy to place before the House notifications 2½ years after they are issued. I want to know whether the Government is trying to make up any acts of omission that have been done by the previous Governments and I am asking whether it is in order to place before us such orders under the signature of people who are not now in office. For example, the notification

dated 14th September 1956, is under the signature of Sri B. Thimmaraj Urs, I.G.P. There are several such notifications. Is it in order to have these orders placed before us? I want a ruling on this, Sir.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN (Kolar Gold Fields).—Sir, the point is that if notifications are to be placed before us after such long delay, would it not result in taking away or would it not impinge on the rights of Members. It is in that light, that we are bringing this to your notice.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA (Nanjangud).—Sir, the notification referred to by my friend Sri Venktai Gowda is the one issued by the Inspector General of Police excepting certain cinematograph shows from levying entertainment tax. That is not what is being laid on the Table. What is being laid on the Table of the House by the Chief Minister is the notification issued under the Motor Vehicles Act. The objection is not appropriate just now.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—That question will have to be examined; in pursuance of the several enactments, these notifications have to be placed before this House. Whether there was inordinate delay in placing them before the House is a matter that has to be examined later on. This is not the appropriate time for discussing this matter.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Let them lay on the Table of the House and then we will see whether there has been inordinate delay in placing them on the Table.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Now the Minister for Revenue has accepted the objection put forward and if that is so, I think this is the proper time for making an answer. For example, you cannot lay on the Table of the House, notifications relating to events which happened ten years ago.

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is the point in dispute. Why it was held back for a long time, has to be examined.

Sri Kadidal MANJAPPA.—We have not accepted that there is any inordinate delay.

Sri U. M. MADAPPA (Chamarajanagar).—Will there be any further time allotted for this purpose, Sir?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have told you that I will examine this matter. Any objection about inordinate delay will be examined later on.

Sri U. M.MADAPPA.—Will there be a statement on this matter?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am going to examine the whole question.

Sri J. H. SHAMSUDDIN (Deputy Minister for Finance).—I beg to lay on the Table the following notifications:—

Notification No. Cin 172—56, dated 14th September 1956,

Notification No. Cin. 175—56, dated 10th October 1956,

Notification No. Cin. 168 –56, dated 17th October 1956,

Notification No. Cin. 182—56, dated 12th November 1955,

Notification No. Cin. 183—56, dated 14th November 1956,

Notification No. Cin. 208—56, dated 29th November 1956,

Notification No. Cin. 196—56, dated 10th December 1956,

Notification No. Cin. 212—56, dated 10th December 1956,

Notification No. Cin 205 –56, dated 11th December 1956,

Notification No. Cin. 237—56, dated 17th December 1956,

Notification No. Cin. 216—56, dated 22nd December 1956,

Notification No. Cin. 235—56, dated 7th January 1957,

Notification No. Cin. 236—56, dated 7th January 1957,

Notification No. Cin. 222—56, dated 11th January 1957,

Notification No. Cin. 244—56, dated 15th January 1957,

Notication No. Cin. 16—57, dated 31st January 1957,

Notification No. Cin. 245—56, dated 11th February 1957,

Notification No. Cin. 1—57, dated 18th February 1957,

Notification No Cin. 8—57, dated 18th March 1957,

Notification No. Cin. 26—57, dated 30th March 1957,

Notification No. Cin. 51—57, dated 22nd April 1957,

Notification No. Cin. 214—56, dated 29th May 1957,

(SRI J. H. HAMSUDDIN)

Notification No. Cin. 24—2—Law—57, dated 14th September 1957,

issued under Section 5 of the Mysore Cinematograph Shows Tax Act, 1951.

Notification No. RD. 13 AIX/58, dated 5th June 1958,

issued under Section 63 of the Mysore Agricultural Income-tax Act, 1957.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—I think this is a more appropriate time for raising the objection.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If the Hon'ble Member has any objection, that will be examined later on.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—May we know when we should bring the objections to your notice ?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have told you already that I am going to examine this matter, and I will see if an opportunity can be given to the Hon'ble Members to discuss it later on.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA (Minister for Law, Labour and Local Self-Government).—I beg to lay on the Table the following notifications :—

Notification No. GB. PCH. 282-III, dated 16th October 1957,

Notification No. GB. PCH. 282-III, dated 28th November 1957,

Notification No. GB. PCH. 282-III, dated 30th November 1957,

Notification No. GB. PCH. S.R-282-I, dated 25th July 1957,

Notification No. PCH. 282-III, dated 23rd May 1958,

Notification No. PCH. 282, dated 17th May 1958,

Notification No. PCH. 282-III, dated 17th May 1958,

Notification No. PCH. 282-II, dated 23rd May 1958,

issued under clause (*b*) of sub-section (1) of Section 108 of the Bombay Village Panchayat Act, 1933.

Sri MALI MARIAPPA.—I beg to lay on the Table the State Warehousing Corporation (Mysore) Rules, 1958 issued under Section 52 (*c*) of the Agricultural Produce (Development and Warehousing) Corporations Act, 1956.

(iii) Promises in connection with Questions on the floor of the House.

Sri B. D. JATTI.—I beg to lay on the Table a statement in connection with Question No. 1272 given notice of by Sri B. K. Nagur, regarding cases of pilferage by bus conductors in the Hyderabad Karnatak area.

Sri K. F. PATIL.—I beg to lay on the Table—

A statement in connection with Question No. 2880 given notice of by Sri V. Srinivas Shetty regarding development of fisheries in the State.

A statement in connection with Question No. 2872 given notice of by Sri B. Channiah, regarding Multipurpurpose Co-operative Society of Pandavapur.

A statement in connection with Question No. 2292 given notice of by Sri G. N. Puttanna, regarding Co-operative Societies liquidated in Tumkur Taluk.

*Sri U. M. MADAPPA.—Sir, in regard to action taken on promises made during answering of questions, the procedure now adopted would take away the right of members to put further questions. The answers or promises were conveyed to us along with the Order Paper. I do not know if this procedure is right.

Mr. SPEAKER.—No right of putting further questions arises. The Ministers have only stated how the promises made on the floor of the House in respect of questions have been fulfilled. That does not give a right to members to raise the matter further.

Sri G. N. PUTTANNA (Tumkur).—May I know where these statements are to be found ?

An HON'BLE MEMBER.—You take the trouble of going to the table and finding it.

Sri G. N. PUTTANNA.—My trouble is that I am being instructed here by a second Speaker (Laughter).

Mr. SPEAKER.—I am sorry that such things are happening. I cannot recognise any second Speaker in this House. Of course the Deputy Speaker is there as the second Speaker, but that

is all. No other person can claim to be the second Speaker.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Sir, you were pleased to say that objections could be raised in respect of the delay in laying the notifications on the table of the House, after the Notifications have been actually laid. This having been done, am I at liberty to raise the matter now?

Mr. SPEAKER.—Hon'ble Member is making a mistake. The Hon'ble Members do not get a right to raise objections no sooner the Notifications are laid before the House. Let the Hon'ble Members look into them and if they find anything objectionable, let them bring it to my notice and I will see what could be done.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Sir, I am not raising anything relating to the contents of the Notifications, but the procedure or the delay involved in laying the Notifications is a matter that ought to be looked into. The section which confers the right of laying Notifications states that they should be notified to the House as early as possible, *i.e.*, it must be brought to the attention of the House as soon as the Notifications themselves are published. The procedure followed now is however improper.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I agree that the Notifications ought to be laid on the Table of the House as early as possible. On the point whether there has been inordinate delay or not in placing the Notifications on the Table of the House, I am going to examine it and if necessary, I will bring the matter before the House and hear the objections of members.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Our difficulty is that the Rules of Procedure contain no provision regulating the placing of such Notifications in time. I think such a provision is necessary. If the Notifications are placed here merely to provide information to the members, I do not think any right as such is conferred on us.

Mr. SPEAKER.—These Notifications are placed here in pursuance of the provisions contained in the respective Acts. The Acts require placing of Notifications on the Table of the House. I am going to look into the matter. After all, members get a right to take objection only after they have been placed on the Table of the House. Now that has been done. Members can look into them and whatever objections they have, let them bring it to my notice.

MYSORE VILLAGE PANCHAYATS AND LOCAL BOARDS BILL, 1958.

Motion to consider (contd.)

Mr. SPEAKER.—So far as the discussion on this Bill is concerned, I wish to bring to the notice of the House that the Bill has been discussed for four days already, *i.e.*, on the 5th, 6th, 7th and 8th of May this year. The following members have taken part in the debate on the Bill :

Sriyuths—

1 K Kenchappa
2 G Anna Rao
3 G Sivappa
4 B G Khot
5 H V Koujalgi
6 V S Patil
7 A Bheemappa Naik
8 M C Narasimhan
9 J B Mallaradhya
10 Balwant Rao
11 B N Boranna Gowda
12 H C Linga Reddy
13 S Y Patil
14 G Venkatai Gowda
15 A S Patil
16 C J Muckannappa
17 T N Mudlagiri Gowda
18 J H Shamsuddin
19 T Siddalingayya

In all 19 members have taken part in the debate. Of course today we are again considering the Bill. I think when we rise today, it would be clear that we have taken sufficient time over this Bill. If Hon'ble Members agree with me, I would like that this Bill be referred to the Select Committee.

* ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಕೆಂಚಪ್ಪ (ಹಿರಿಯೂರು).—ಈ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗಲೇ ವಿಧಾನ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಚರ್ಚೆ ನಡೆದಿದೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪಕಾಲ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಈ ದಿವಸ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಸೆಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸ ಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ. ಈ ಸಭೆ ನೀಡುವ ಉಪಯುಕ್ತ ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡಕ ಮಾಡುವ